

Serial No. 10/695,753
Amendment dated PROPOSED
Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2006

Docket No. HI-0182

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. In this paper, claims 1, 10, and 20 have been amended to clarify the inventions defined therein and new claim 22 has been added to recite additional features of the invention.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Lee-Weindorf combination. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “independently storing brightness control information in a first power mode for an adjusted one of the levels and in a second power mode for an adjusted one of the levels” and controlling the brightness level of the display “based on the brightness control information independently stored for the confirmed power mode.” The Lee and Weindorf patents do not teach or suggest these features.

The Lee patent discloses storing a table of brightness level information but only for one type of power supply. The Weindorf patent stores a similar table for only one type of power mode. Neither patent teaches or suggests the features added by amendment to claim 1, i.e., independently storing brightness control information for a plurality of power modes and then controlling a brightness level of the display based on brightness control information independently stored for a confirmed one of the power modes. Absent a teaching or suggestion

of these features, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims are non-obvious and thus patentable over a Lee-Weindorf combination

Claims 10-19 under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Lee-Weindorf-Woo combination. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite features similar to those which patentably distinguish claim 1 from the Lee and Weindorf patents. For example, claim 10 recites “independently storing brightness level information for a plurality of power supplies in a computer system” and then “selecting a brightness level information from the independently stored information, the brightness level information corresponding to the determined power supply type for the adjusted brightness level of the display.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Lee and Weindorf patents.

The Woo patent is also deficient in this respect. The Woo patent was cited for disclosing brightness information stored in a memory. However, Woo does not teach or suggest “independently storing brightness level information for a plurality of power supplies in a computer system” and then “selecting a brightness level information from the independently stored information, the brightness level information corresponding to the determined power supply type for the adjusted brightness level of the display.”

Moreover, Lee, Weindorf, and Woo fail to teach or suggest “independently storing the index information according to the type of power supply” with the stored brightness control information as further recited in claim 10.

Based on at least these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited combination.

Claim 11 recites that “at least one of an index information corresponding to an adjusted brightness level in an AC adaptor power mode and an index information corresponding to an adjusted brightness level in a battery power mode is separately stored in the memory.” The Examiner relied on the Lee and Weindorf patents to supply these features. However, as discussed above, neither Lee nor Weindorf teaches or suggests separately storing index information for adjusted brightness levels in different power modes as recited in claim 11.

Claim 16 recites “independently storing index information corresponding a brightness level of the display in at least two different power modes,” and then adjusting a brightness of the display using information on a current power mode being used and the “stored index information” for the brightness level of the current power mode when the power mode is changed. These features are not taught or suggested by the Lee, Weindorf, and Woo patents, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Lee-Weindorf-Fujimura combination.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite “a second storage device configured to independently store brightness level information in a first power mode for an adjusted one of the levels and in a second power mode for an adjusted one of the levels” and that the control means controls a PWM frequency of the inverter to achieve a designated brightness level “based

Serial No. 10/695,753
Amendment dated PROPOSED
Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2006

Docket No. HI-0182

on the LCD brightness level information independently stored in the second storage device for the current power supply mode." These features are not taught or suggested by the Lee, Weindorf, and Fujimura patents, whether taken alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros, Esq.
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/SWN/lm
Date: JULY 11, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610